



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/740,226	12/19/2000	Shepherd Shi	AUS9-2000-0761-US1	4532

7590 05/05/2003

Barry S. Newberger
Winstead Sechrest & Minick P.C.
5400 Renaissance Tower
1201 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75270

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CINDY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/740,226

Applicant(s)

SHI ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03/31/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 April 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 03/31/03.

1. Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversal et al. (U.S 6366954) (Traversal) in view of Bachmann et al. (U.S 6085188) (Bachmann).

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Traversal disclose: A search method and system comprising the steps of :

determining if a first parameter (distinguished name) has a first predetermined value (col. 6, lines 13-29, Traversal); and

if said first parameter has said first predetermined value (bu, col. 6, lines 29-44, Traversal), said first node being referenced by a value of a first member of a second node in response to said first member of said second node having a predetermined type (col. 6, lines 45 to col. 7, lines 15, Traversal).

However, Traversal is silent to disclose: returning a value of each of one or more selected members of a first node. On the other hand, Bachmann disclose: returning a value of each of one or more selected members of a first node (col. 7, lines 16-38, Bachmann). Thus, at the time

Art Unit: 2171

invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step for returning a value of each of one or more selected members of a first node in the system Traversal of as taught by Bachmann. The motivation being to enable the user to send back the matching value to the LDAP and provide a faster and more efficient method to support LDAP searches.

Claim 10 is a computer program product of claim 1. Thus it is rejected as set forth claim 1 above. In addition Traversal/Bachmann disclose: a computer program product embodied in a tangible medium (col. 15, lines 25-53, Traversal).

Regarding claims 2, 11 and 20, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively. In addition, Traversal/Bachmann disclose: further comprising the step of determining if a second member of said second node matches a value of a second parameter (col. 12, lines 1-31, Traversal).

Regarding claims 3, 12 and 21, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 2, 11 and 20, respectively. In addition, Traversal/Bachmann disclose: wherein said step of returning said value of each of one or more members of said first node is in response to said second member of said second node matching said value of said second parameter (col. 10, lines 16-38, Traversal).

Regarding claims 4, 13 and 22, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively. In addition, Traversal/Bachmann disclose: further

Art Unit: 2171

comprising the step of returning values of a selected set of members of said second node (col. 11, lines 21-41, Traversal).

Regarding claims 5, 14 and 23, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 4, 13 and 22, respectively. In addition, Traversal/Bachmann disclose: further comprising the step of determining if a second member of said second node matches a value of a second parameter (col. 6, lines 45 to col. 7, lines 15, Traversal), and wherein said step of returning values of said selected set of members of said second node is in response to said second member of said second node matching said value of said second parameter (col. 7, lines 16-39, Bachmann). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the step of returning values of said selected set of members of said second node is in response to said second member of said second node matching said value of said second parameter in the system of Traversal as taught Bachmann. The motivation being to enable the user to provide a faster and more efficient method to support LDAP searches.

Regarding claims 6, 15 and 25, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively. In addition, Traversal/ Bachmann disclose: further comprising the step of, if said first parameter has said first predetermined value (col. 6, lines 29-44, Traversal), returning a value of each of one or more selected members of a third node (col. 8, lines 35-59, Bachmann), said third node being referenced by a value of a first member of said

Art Unit: 2171

first node in response to said first member of said first node having said predetermined type (col. 8, lines 50-64, Traversal).

Regarding claims 7, 16 and 26, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 6, 15 and 25, respectively. In addition, Traversal/ Bachmann disclose: wherein said selected members of said first node and said selected members of said third node are selected in response to a value of a second parameter (col. 8, lines 5-59, Bachmann).

Regarding claims 8, 17 and 26, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 19, respectively. In addition, Traversal/ Bachmann disclose: wherein said first parameter comprises a parameter of a set of parameters in a search request (fig. 2A and corresponding text, Traversal).

Regarding claims 9, 18 and 27, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 8, 17 and 26, respectively. In addition, Traversal/ Bachmann disclose: wherein said search request comprises a Lightweight Directory Access Protocol (LDAP) search request (col. 5, lines 39-59, Traversal).

3. Response to Arguments

a. Drawings

Applicant's arguments have been found persuasive.

b. USC § 103 Rejection

Art Unit: 2171

Applicant argues, the EID in Bachmann "is not a value of a distinguished name." (see p.3, response filed 02/31/01). The Examiner agrees. Accordingly. The Examiner has reconsider the rejection and have determined the claims are still not patentable. However, the examiner has changed the grounds of rejection, see above.

4. Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Schueck et al. (U.S 6260039). Web interface and method for accessing directory informations.

Martin et al. (U.S 2001/0011277). Network directory access mechanism.

Grimmer (U.S 5774552). Method and apparatus for retrieving X.509 certificates from an X.500 directory.

5. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 703-305-4698. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2171

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Cindy Nguyen
April 30, 2003



SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100